

The case of addressees in Dravido-Portuguese

O caso dos interlocutores em Drávido-Português

Hugo Cardoso¹

Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal
hcardoso@clul.ul.pt

Abstract: This article is a study of the Dravido-Portuguese creoles of the Malabar (modern-day Kerala, India) and Sri Lanka in terms of the formal means they use to mark the addressee arguments of various predicates of verbal interaction (e.g. talk, say, ask), and compares the functional range of such markers in the creoles with their counterparts in the lexifier language (Portuguese) and in the Dravidian adstrates (Malayalam and Tamil). This comparative study shows the different contributions of the lexifier and of the adstrates to the case-marking system of the present-day Dravido-Portuguese creoles, as well as the ways in which the functional range of the creole case-markers reveal diachronic processes of functional reanalysis.

Keywords: Dravido-Portuguese creoles, addressees, case-marking.

Resumo: Este artigo consiste num estudo dos crioulos drávido-portugueses do Malabar (actualmente Kerala, na Índia) e do Sri Lanka em termos dos meios usados para marcar formalmente os interlocutores de diversos predicados de interação verbal (ex. conversar, dizer, pedir), no qual se compara a amplitude funcional dos marcadores crioulos com a dos seus equivalentes na língua lexificadora (o português) e nos adstratos dravídicos

¹ I would like to thank Ian Smith for kindly sharing with me unpublished Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese data, and also an anonymous reviewer for his/her comments and suggestions.

(o malaiala e o tâmul). Este estudo comparativo demonstra os diferentes contributos do lexificador e dos adstratos para o sistema de marcação casual dos actuais crioulos drávido-portugueses, bem como o modo como a amplitude funcional dos marcadores casuais crioulos revela processos diacrónicos de reanálise funcional.

Palavras-chave: Crioulos drávido-portugueses, interlocutores, marcação casual.

1 Introduction

In Schuchardt's (1889a) classification, Dravido-Portuguese (*Dravidoportugiesisch*) referred to the subset of Portuguese-lexified creoles formed in the Dravidian-majority areas of Southern India and Northeastern Sri Lanka. Although Indo-Portuguese creoles were once numerous across the Dravidosphere (Schuchardt 1889a; Tomás 1992; Smith 1995; Cardoso 2006), to the best of my knowledge they subsist only in Cannanore [Kannur] in the Indian state of Kerala, and in the Sri Lankan cities of Batticaloa and Trincomalee.

Smith's (1979a,b) research on the Indo-Portuguese of Batticaloa has shown that, in many domains, this language has come to resemble significantly the major language of the region, Tamil, with which it has been in close contact throughout its history (see also Bakker 2006) - and recent descriptive work on the Indo-Portuguese of India's Southwestern coast reveals a comparable (though not entirely equivalent) process of metatypy under the influence of the dominant local language, Malayalam (Cardoso 2012).

Among various examples of isomorphism, Smith (1979a) highlights the similarity in the functional range of case-markers in Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese and in Tamil. This article focuses on a particular aspect of case-marking in the Dravido-Portuguese creoles, namely the assignment of case to Addressee arguments, arguments which are associated with verbs of verbal interaction such as *talk*, *say*, or *ask* (see 1.2). Addressee arguments can be treated in different ways in different languages and, as a matter of fact, constitute one domain in which the languages involved in the contact equation which gave rise to the Dravido-Portuguese Creoles (primarily Portuguese, Malayalam and Tamil) diverge quite markedly. I have therefore selected this particular domain of case-marking in order to explore the extent to which the Dravido-Portuguese Creoles reveal the impact of the Dravidian languages among which they developed, innovate, or retain case-marking patterns modelled on their main lexifier (Portuguese).

1.1 *Dravido-Portuguese sources*

While some early data is available for Dravido-Portuguese creoles elsewhere (e.g. Teza 1872; Schuchardt 1882, 1883, 1889b; Dalgado 1900, 1917; Tavares de Mello 1908; Jackson 1990; see also Tomás 1992; Ladhams 2009), the only ones which have been documented in recent times are those of Batticaloa (studied in the 1970s by Ian Smith), Cannanore [Kannur] and the recently-disappeared creole of Vypeen, off Cochin [Kochi] (documented by myself since 2006). It is on the basis of these recent studies and corpora that I set out to explore the case-marking patterns of addressees in the Dravido-Portuguese creoles:

- The Batticaloa variety described by Smith (1977, 1979a, 1979b, 2013), the only one to have been researched in recent times, is taken as representative of *Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese* [SLIP]. As a matter of fact, plenty of the earlier records of Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese refer to other geographical variants and therefore, in theory, one could ascertain to what extent patterns of case-assignment varied across the island in the past; however, since there are reasons to question the authenticity and reliability of a good deal of the early Sri Lankan corpus (see Smith 1977; also Cardoso, Baxter & Nunes 2012), the focus here will be mostly synchronic;
- The corpora recently collected in Cochin and in Cannanore are largely equivalent, therefore we will refer to both varieties generically as *Malabar Indo-Portuguese* [MIP], after the old name for the coast of modern-day Kerala. Here too, despite the availability of short 19th-c. collections of texts, we will restrict our analysis to the modern data.

Given that the Dravido-Portuguese creoles have no conventionalized orthography, the reader will encounter substantial variation. In the case of Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese, I have retained the spelling developed by Smith for his published descriptions. In the case of Malabar Indo-Portuguese, given that linguistic documentation is an ongoing process, no final phonologically-based orthography has yet been developed; therefore, I resort to phonetic transcription here. With respect to example sentences in other languages, I use either the official orthography (in the case of Portuguese) or the romanisation adopted by the authors of the source grammars (for Malayalam and Tamil).

In order to conduct this study, relevant data was collected not only for Malabar Indo-Portuguese and Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese, but also for their respective adstrates (Malayalam and Tamil) and for their main lexifier (Portuguese). As the intention was to be able to compare the functional range of case-markers involved in Addressee-marking in each language, the research proceeded in three steps:

Step 1: I collected example sentences for all five languages containing predicates of verbal interaction of the three types described above;

Step 2: For each of the five languages, I identified the default semantic roles expressed by all of the case-markers compiled in Step 1; for the purposes of this particular study, I will label these the *associate semantic roles* (as they are associated with the case markers attested for Addressees). Overall, seven associate semantic roles were identified in step 2: Patient, Recipient, Companion, Instrument, Temporary Possessor, Location, Goal;

Step 3: I collected example sentences for all five languages containing arguments with all seven associate semantic roles.

The results are given in section 2 below, which includes examples of all three types of predicates of verbal interaction and of all seven associate semantic roles for each of the five languages. The data are then compared and discussed in section 3, revealing a complex interplay of influences. This study provides ample evidence that, in high-contact languages, the phonetic representation of a particular (grammatical) element and its function need not be sourced from the same donor language nor match any entirely. It therefore confirms the insights of language contact scholars who have argued for the need to distinguish between the transfer of linguistic forms and the transfer of semantic or functional range – what Matras (2009) terms *matter* (also *fabric*, in Grant 2012) and *pattern* respectively.

2 Case-marking of addressees and associate semantic roles

2.1 Malabar Indo-Portuguese

The corpus of Malabar Indo-Portuguese which I have been collecting in Cannanore and Vypeen in the past years is composed of elicited material and recordings of spontaneous discourse. As mentioned earlier, the recordings made in Vypeen and in Cannanore are equivalent to a large extent, and therefore they will be treated here as complementary; nonetheless, for clarity, I indicate where and how each example sentence was collected. Although the treatment of this corpus is still ongoing, it was possible to extract several instances of both Addressee arguments and participants with the associate semantic roles.

2.1.1 Addressees in Malabar Indo-Portuguese

In Malabar Indo-Portuguese, Addressee arguments of *talk*-type predicates (Addressee_{TALK}) most often consist of an NP followed by the postposition *pərtə* ‘near’ (2), which requires a linking morpheme *-sə* that also functions as a default genitive marker. However, elicitation reveals that *-jūtadə*, typically a comitative/instrumental marker, is a possible alternative (3b):

- (2) Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Elicited corpus)

pərmi bəs-sə māj-sə pərtə kəra kōbersa, bəs-sə pərtə
 1S.OBL you-GEN mother-GEN near want talk you-GEN near
nə
 not
 ‘I want to talk to your mother, not to you.’

- (3) a. Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Elicited corpus)

Stanley portuguese līgwaji Yvonne-sə pərtə tē
 Stanley portuguese language Yvonne-GEN near be.PRS
kōbersa.
 talk

- b. Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Elicited corpus)

Stanley portuguese līgwaji Yvonne jūtadə tē
 Stanley portuguese language Yvonne COM be.PRS
kōbersa.
 talk
 ‘Stanley is talking in Portuguese with Yvonne.’

All other addressees in the corpus occur with the postposition *pərtə*. This is exemplified in (4) for Addressee arguments of *tell*-type predicates (Addressee_{TELL}), and in (5) for those of *ask*-type predicates (Addressee_{ASK}); notice that, in (4) and (5b), the fact that the 1S pronoun has a dedicated Genitive form does away with the need for the linking morpheme *-sə*:

- (4) Cochin Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Oral corpus)

minhə pərtə fala ki kəra.
 1S.GEN near say what want
 ‘Tell me what you want.’

- (5) a. Cochin Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Oral corpus)
kawa el jə fala pay-sə pærtə pisīn fana tama da.
 then 3SM PST say father-GEN near little money take give
 ‘Then he told father to give a little money.’
- b. Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Elicited corpus)
Olivia-sə filhə minhə pærtə jə fūta præla pu asisti.
 Olivia-GEN daughter 1S.GEN near PST ask 3SM.OBL to help
 ‘Olivia’s child asked me to help her.’

2.1.2 Associate semantic roles in Malabar Indo-Portuguese

In Malabar Indo-Portuguese, the case-marking of patients responds to animacy. As shown below, animate participants are marked with postposed *-pə* (6a), while inanimate participants are assigned no case-marker at all (6b):

- (6) a. Cochin Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Oral corpus)
ælfōti-pə jə faze tirə
 elephant-OBL PST make shot
 ‘[We] shot elephants.’
- b. Cochin Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Oral corpus)
agə friw kerə faze.
 water cool want make
 ‘[You] must cool the water.’

In (6a), *-pə* is glossed OBL[ique] because, in addition to marking animate patients, it also marks recipients (7):

- (7) a. Cochin Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Oral corpus)
akəl ja da sə, paymi ūga mil rupi lo da.
 DEM PST give COND 1S.OBL one thousand rupee IRR give
 ‘If [I] delivered it [i.e., a skin], [they] would give me one thousand rupees.’
- b. Cochin Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Oral corpus)
paymi tə kādə acha, olotə-pə tēmē lo da kovəri.
 1S.OBL be.PRS when get 3P-OBL also IRR give money
 ‘When I got [it], I would also give them money.’

Both companions (8a) and instruments (8b) occur with a case-marker which, in the corpus, assumes two slightly different realizations as *-sūtadə* or *-jūtadə*:

- (8) a. Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Elicited corpus)
Olivia-sə fili minhə krəskrāsə-sūtadə tə brīka.
 Olivia-GEN child 1S.GEN children-COM be.PRS play
 ‘Olivia’s son is playing with my children.’
- b. Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Elicited corpus)
nəz fakə-jūtadə kək lo kebrə
 1P knife-INST coconut IRR break
 ‘One breaks coconuts with a knife.’

In predicative possessive constructions, generic possessors are typically dative-marked in Malabar Indo-Portuguese. However, when it comes to temporary possession, the possessor is embedded in a particular locative phrase meaning ‘inside X’s hand’:

- (9) Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Elicited corpus)
əla pərmi prasāti nukə da əla-sə mō-dētrə fanə nutə
 1SF 1S.OBL present NEG give 3SF-GEN hand-inside money NEG.be
suyda.
 because
 ‘She didn’t give me a present because she didn’t have money.’

The morphological markers of locations, as expected, include an array of alternatives to convey semantic distinctions; for our purposes, in addition to generic location, those used to indicate proximate location and adjacency are particularly relevant. The Malabar Indo-Portuguese corpus contains the generic locative marker *-dētrə* (10a,b) and the marker of proximate location *pərtə* (10c), with the same collocational properties described for examples (2) and (3) above:

- (10) a. Cochin Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Oral corpus)
akə sister paymi hotel-dētrə ũga sirvis ja oʔa da.
 DEM sister 1S.OBL hotel-LOC one job PST look give
 ‘That sister found me a job at a hotel.’

- b. Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Oral corpus)
market-dētrə tudə tē.
 market-LOC all be.PRS
 ‘There’s everything in the market.’
- c. Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Elicited corpus)
hotel-sə pærtə ũnga igrædji tæ.
 hotel-GEN near one church be.PRS
 ‘There’s a church near the hotel.’

Goals are often unmarked when the predicates disambiguate the intended reading, as in (11a), or indicated by the oblique [dative-accusative] (11b) or locative marker (11c):

- (11) a. Cochin Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Oral corpus)
olotrə akəl Mysore lo māda.
 3P DEM Mysore IRR send
 ‘They would send it to Mysore.’
- b. Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Elicited corpus)
yo minhə irmē-pə lo māda.
 1S 1S.GEN sister-OBL IRR send
 ‘I will send [it] to my sister.’
- c. Cannanore Indo-Portuguese (Cardoso: Elicited corpus)²
yo minhə irmē pærtə lo māda.
 1S 1S.GEN sister near IRR send
 ‘I will send [it] to my sister.’

2.2 *Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese*

For this exploration of the case of Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese addressees, as discussed in 1.1., I rely mostly on the descriptions published by Ian Smith (1977, 1979a, 1979b, 2013), which are based on his work with the Indo-Portuguese community of Batticaloa, as well as additional data Smith kindly provided for this study. While, admittedly, Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese may diverge somewhat from other past and present variants of Sri Lanka, at this point no significant and reliable sources are available for other variants.

²The reader will notice that this particular example contradicts what has been said earlier about the requirement that *pærtə* occurs after a linking morpheme *-sə*. It is indeed one of the few examples of this, which I interpret as a result of the conversational setting (elicitation) and/or perhaps the over-productivity of the blocking effect of *minhə*.

2.2.1 Addressees in Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese

The sentences in (12a) and (12b) demonstrate Addressee_{TALK} arguments in Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese:

- (12) a. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith, p.c. June 2013)
fōra jeentis juuntu pa-papiyaa etus-su vergōña.
 outside people LOC INF-speak 3P-GEN shame
 ‘Speaking with outside people is a shame to them.’
- b. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1977: 172)
e:w ja:-fəla: ənda: pa:y-ntu fəla:-tu vira: vi: miñə-ntu
 I PST-tell go father-LOC tell-PFV back come I-LOC
diñe:ru tri:yə fəla:-tu.
 money bring QUOT-PFV
 ‘I said, “Go tell (talk to?) your father [then] come back and bring me the money.”’

This type of addressee is assigned two related markers, viz. *juuntu*³ and *-(u)ntu*. In Smith’s (1977: 171) interpretation, *-(u)ntu* is a reduced form of the postposition *juuntu* which “has become specialized as a locative case affix with the meaning ‘at, in, on, etc.’”, and therefore I will treat the two separately.

-(u)ntu also occurs with Addressee_{TELL} (13) and Addressee_{ASK} (14) arguments⁴, but the available corpus does not contain any instance with

³In some of the earliest publications by Smith, a colon after a vowel was used to indicate it is long, while in later publications this is done by doubling the vowel grapheme: e.g. <*ju:ntu*> is equivalent to <*juuntu*>. Given that this study extracted examples from several sources, both orthographies can be found in example sentences, but I have opted for the double grapheme strategy in my discussion.

⁴The early 20th-c. texts published by Tavares de Mello in 1908 provide an interesting clue with respect to Addressee_{ASK} arguments. In these religious texts (exact provenance unknown), the addressees of the verb *rugá* ‘pray/ask’ are always preceded by the preposition *com* ‘with’, which also occurs here as a comitative and instrumental marker:

(i) Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese (Tavares de Mello 1908[1998]: 118)
Poristo nós te rugá com Ti ajudá per teus servidores [...]
 therefore 1P be ask with 2S help OBL your.P servants
 ‘Therefore, we ask you to help your servants [...]

juuntu. In addition, Smith (p.c. June 2013) recognises another form *-(u)ntaa*⁵ that functions generically as a ‘human locative’ and also occurs with addressees – see (13a) and (14b). Lastly, an alternative oblique marker *-pə* is also attested in the corpus with *tell*-type predicates (13b):

- (13) a. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith, p.c. June 2013)

boos ja-falaa voo ricad-untaa falaatu.

2S PST-say IND Richard-LOC QUOT

‘Have you told Richard?’

- b. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1979a: 202)

ung gə:tə je:ntis-pə me: (ja:-)fəla: tiñə.

a few people-OBL EMPH PST-tell was

‘He had only told a few people.’

- (14) a. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1977: 161)

e:w e:li-ntu ja:-fəla: əwərə ung suma:nə.

I he-LOC PST-tell now one week

‘It is now one week since I told him [to tell you to come and see me].’

- b. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 2013)

avara osiyoor taam [nəyva-ntaa] lo-puntaa, [...]

now 3SG.HON also [bride-LOC] FUT-ask

‘Now he will also ask [the bride] [...].’

2.2.2 Associate semantic roles in Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese

The published Batticaloa corpus does not contain examples of all relevant patient categories, but Smith (1977: 165) clarifies *-pə* is the default accusative suffix for human referents (15a), while *-Ø* marks inanimates (15b), and either one or the other may occur with non-human animates:

⁵ *-(u)ntaa* is presumably modelled on *juntaadu*, which occurs in the corpus only as a de-verbal adjective and not as a postposition (Ian Smith, p.c. June 2013).

- (15) a. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 2013)
tɔɔna voos isti ravkiin ki-kustumaa jeentis-pa un
 afterwards 2S this violin HAB-practice people-OBL a
gɔɔta bata laraa [...]
 little hit PFV
 ‘Then shake up these people who are practicing violin a little [...]’
- b. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1979b: 192)
nōs oy ənōti vīnu lo-bevə
 we today night arrack POT-drink
 ‘We will drink arrack tonight.’

In addition, *-pə* is also a dative affix, as it marks recipient arguments. Given that the same affix is used for both (animate) patients and recipients, I label the marker OBL[ique]:

- (16) Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1979a: 201)
e:w eli-pə diñe:ru já:-dá:
 I he-OBL money PST-give
 ‘I gave him the money.’

Companions take the postposition *juuntu*:

- (17) Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1977: 172)
nɔ:ɣwə ta:m əkə ley me: nɔ:ɣwə-su je:ntis ju:ntu lo-ənda:
 bride also DEM like EMPH bride-GEN people with POT-go
gre:jə.
 church
 ‘The bride also in the very same way goes with the bride’s people to the church.’

Instruments, on the other hand, select a different postposition *wɔ:ndə*:

- (18) Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1977: 169)
miñe muye:re ja:-limpa: (ne) ispe:y p:anu wɔ:ndə.
 my wife PST-clean — mirror cloth INST
 ‘My wife cleaned the mirror with a cloth.’

While no strategy is reported in the literature as marking temporary possession specifically, Smith (p.c. June 2013) clarifies that Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese co-opts the ‘human locative’ case-marker *-(u)ntaa* to indicate alienable possession (19a), which is a logical condition of temporary possession but is also wider in scope. Having put forth this caveat, I will nonetheless consider this construction in our discussion, as it establishes an interesting connection with other languages involved. Interestingly, the available corpus also contains a similar construction with *-ntu* instead of *-(u)ntaa* (19b).

- (19) a. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith, p.c. June 2013)

nosa-ntaa noov taan teem naa?

1p.GEN-LOC new CONJ be TAG

‘We have a new [violin] too, don’t we?’

- b. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith forthcoming)

[...] **ɔmi-ntu teem naa doos alaa**

man-LOC be.PRS TAG two there

‘[...] that man has two there, no?’

Generic location is marked by *-(u)ntu*, which we have encountered earlier in connection with addressees (20a,b). The postposition *-(su) pɛertu* indicates proximate location (20c):

- (20) a. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1979a: 198)

iskɔ:lə-ntu tudus mɛlwa:r

school-LOC everyone Tamil

‘In school everyone is Tamil.’

- b. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1977: 171)

tɔ:nə fuwa:m-ntu gərda: mɛstə-kuzə

then fire-LOC keep OPT-boil

‘Then you must put [it] on the fire and boil [it].’

- c. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith, p.c. June 2013)

nɔɔyva-su pɛertu doos stronay-s taam mesa-santaa

bride-GEN near two bridesmaid-P CNJ must-sit

‘Next to the bride, two bridesmaids must also sit.’

Goals are unmarked (21a) if inanimate, but receive locative *-(u)ntu* otherwise ((21b); see also (12b):

- (21) a. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1979b: 192)
 ēw əmiām kulumbu tə-əndā
 1S tomorrow Colombo PRS-go
 ‘I am going to Colombo tomorrow.’
 b. Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese (Smith 1979a: 198)
 pa:y-ntu ənda:
 father-LOC go
 ‘Go to father.’

2.3 Portuguese

Portuguese indicates case by way of prepositions or, in the case of some pronominal case distinctions, through morphology. As the major lexifier of both Indo-Portuguese varieties at the centre of this study, it must be taken in as a potential source not only of the forms used to express case but also of case-marking strategies.

2.3.1 Addressees in Portuguese

With regard to the case of addressees, both European Portuguese and Classical (i.e. 16th- through 18th-c.) Portuguese establish a boundary separating Addressee_{TALK} arguments from Addressee_{TELL} and Addressee_{ASK} arguments. Addressees of *talk*-type predicates command the preposition *com* ‘with’:

- (22) Portuguese (constructed sentence)
 A Luísa fala / conversa com a sua mãe.
 DEF.F Luísa speak.PRS.3S talk.PRS.3S with DEF.F her mother
 ‘Luísa talks to her mother.’

Addressees associated with other types of predicates of verbal interaction are marked by dative *a*, if nominal, or corresponding indirect object forms of personal pronouns:

- (23) a. Portuguese (constructed sentence)
 A Luísa disse uma mentira a uma amiga.
 DEF.F Luísa say.PST.3S IND.F lie DAT IND.F friend
 ‘Luísa told a lie to a friend.’
 b. Portuguese (constructed sentence)
 A Luísa perguntou a uma amiga as horas.
 DEF.F Luísa ask.PST.3S DAT IND.F friend IND.F.P hour.P
 ‘Luísa asked a friend the time.’

2.3.2 Associate semantic roles in Portuguese

In Modern Portuguese, nominal patients are unmarked, and personal pronouns have specific direct object forms, as demonstrated in (24a). Having said that, it is also true that certain verbs with a patient argument in their semantic valency attribute a specific preposition to their objects, such as locative *em* 'in' or dative *a* 'to' (24b). In addition, the preposition *a* (prototypically associated with recipients, see below) does surface in a few constrained cases, most notably before a pronominal patient in cases when the use of a stressed personal pronoun is required (as e.g. to attribute focus to the patient) - contrast the sentence in (24c) with (24a):

- (24) a. Portuguese (constructed sentence)
Eu empurrei-o / o João.
 1S push.PST.1S=3SM.ACC DEF.M João
 'I pushed him / João.'
- b. Portuguese (constructed sentence)
Não bati em / a ninguém.
 NEG hit.PST.1S LOC DAT nobody
 'I haven't hit anyone.'
- c. Portuguese (constructed sentence)
Eu empurrei-o a ele.
 1S push.PST.1S=3SM.ACC DAT 3SM
 'It was him that I pushed.'

A relevant issue here is the fact that, in Classical Portuguese, more direct objects occurred with preposition *a* than they do nowadays. Schäfer-Prieß (2002) identifies a tendency to associate preposition *a* to highly individuated participants (e.g. proper nouns), which had its peak in the period between the 16th and the 18th century, even if there is considerable variation in the production of different authors. According to another study, in 16th-c. texts the human patients of verbs such as *ameaçar* 'threaten', *castigar* 'punish', *consolar* 'console', or *prender* 'arrest' were routinely preceded by the preposition *a*, whereas they are not in Contemporary Portuguese (Silva Neto 1970: 510-511)⁶.

Interestingly, the preposition *a*, which we have encountered with addressees in 2.3.1, is also the one that introduces nominal recipients in Portuguese, and is therefore treated as the default dative case-marker:

⁶According to Teyssier (2005: 467), the incidence of *a* introducing direct objects was already much more limited than in Spanish, in which to this day human objects are introduced by the preposition *a* - see also Schäfer-Prieß (2002: 409).

(25) Portuguese (constructed sentence)

Vou dar um presente a um amigo.
 go.PRS.1S give.INF IND.m gift DAT IND.m friend
 ‘[I] will give a present to a friend.’

Both companions (26a) and instruments (26b) take the preposition *com* ‘with’, although there are several other choices of prepositions to introduce companions:

(26) a. Portuguese (constructed sentence)

A Luísa vai à escola (junto) com /
 DEF.F Luísa go.PRS.3S to.DEF.F school together with
mais a amiga.
 in.addition DEF.F friend
 ‘Luísa goes to school with [her] friend.’

b. Portuguese (constructed sentence)

Abre a porta com esta chave.
 open.IMP DEF.F door with this.F key
 ‘Open the door with this key.’

In Portuguese, possessors which function as subjects of predicative possessive constructions with the verb *ter* ‘to have’ are unmarked. However, in order to convey a notion of temporary possession, an adjunct PP may be added in which the possessor is recovered (often anaphorically) and marked by the comitative/instrumental preposition *com* (27). It is worth noting that, syntactically, this construction is not comparable to the argument case-marking observed for Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese:

(27) Portuguese (constructed sentence)

A Luísa não tinha dinheiro com ela / consigo.
 DEF.F Luísa NEG have.PST.IPFV.3S money COM 3SF 3.COM
 ‘Luísa didn’t have money on her.’

As shown in (26), one option to introduce companions is to use the word *junto* ‘together, next to’ before the comitative preposition *com*. This construction is nowadays particularly common in Brazilian Portuguese, and builds on the inherent semantics of the word: as an adverb, *junto* also introduces the notion of shared agency (e.g. *fomos juntos* ‘[we] went together’) and, in combination of other prepositions (*de* or *a*), constructs proximate or adjacent **location** (28):

(28) Portuguese (constructed sentence)

A chave está junto a esse vaso.

DEF.F key be.PRS.3S next to that pot

‘The key is near/next to that pot.’

In addition, *em* ‘in, at’ marks generic location in Portuguese (29a), whereas the complex *perto de* ‘near’ is a dedicated marker of proximate location (29b), and the language furthermore has a host of other complex prepositions to establish finer semantic distinctions:

(29) a. Portuguese (constructed sentence)

A chave ficou em casa.

DEF.F key stay.PST.3S in home

‘The key stayed at home.’

b. Portuguese (constructed sentence)

A chave está perto de um vaso.

DEF.F key be.PRS.3S near to IND.M pot

‘The key is near a pot.’

The preposition *a* we have seen earlier as a marker of addressees, patients and recipients recurs with goals, in which function it competes with *para* ‘to’; the distinction between the two lies in the time-stability of the predicate, in that goals introduced by *para* are seen as more permanent than those introduced by *a*:

(30) Portuguese (constructed sentence)

Vamos a / para casa.

go.PRS.1P to to home

‘[We]’re going home.’

2.4 Malayalam

Malayalam, the major language of the modern Indian state of Kerala (which includes the coastal stretch formerly known as the Malabar), is especially important as the major sub-/adstrate of Malabar Indo-Portuguese. Yet, given that the earliest Portuguese settlements in Asia were precisely located in the Malayalam-speaking region, scholars have hypothesised that the contact between Malayalam and Portuguese was foundational in the formation of Portuguese-based creoles elsewhere in Asia (see Smith 1977: 143ff; Clements 2000, 2009), which would grant Malayalam a seminal role over a wider subset of Asian-Portuguese than just that of the Malabar.

2.4.1 Addressees in Malayalam

Malayalam has a nominal suffix *-ooṭə* expressing a typically Dravidian case often called *sociative* or *associative* in the literature (see Krishnamurti 2003: 235-237; Asher & Kumari 1997: 191ff), reserved for the stimuli of psych verbs (e.g. love, pity, be indebted) and the arguments of various predicates indicating social interaction (e.g. fight, borrow, excuse). This case is the one assigned to addressees of all types. Sentence (31a) exemplifies this for Addressee_{TALK} arguments, (31b) for Addressee_{TELL} arguments (and 35c,d) for Addressee_{ASK} arguments:

- (31) a. Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 61)
ṇaan ɖookṭar-ooṭə samsaariccu
 1S doctor-SOC speak.PST
 ‘I spoke to the doctor.’
- b. Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 109)
raaman raadhay-ooṭə oru kaaryam paraṇṇu
 Raman Radha-SOC a thing tell.PST
 ‘Raman told Radha something.’
- c. Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 48)
ṇaan ampalatt-il pookukayaanoo ennə kuṭṭi enn-ooṭə
 1S temple-LOC go.IMPV.PRS.INT QUOT child 1S-SOC
coodiccu
 ask.PST
 ‘The child asked me if I was going to the temple.’
- d. Malayalam (Nair 2012: 35)
keeraḷam sanḍaṛṣikkaṇam ennū aṇṇay-ooṭū avar
 Kerala visit.OBLG QUOT you-SOC they
apeekṣiccirunnu
 request.PST.CONT
 ‘They had requested you to visit Kerala.’

2.4.2 Associate semantic roles in Malayalam

Typical patients take the accusative marker *-e*, as shown in (32):

- (32) Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 60)
pooliiskaaran vaṭi koṇṭə kuṭṭiy-e aṭiccu
 policeman stick INST child-ACC beat-PST
 ‘The policeman beat the child with a stick.’

Recipients, on the other hand, take a dative suffix which is sensitive to the phonological context of insertion and can therefore be realised as *-kkə*, *-nə* or *-ə*:

- (33) a. Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 181)
raaman innale kɻʃɳan-nə raɳtə pustakamm koʈuttu
 Raman yesterday Krishna-DAT two book give.PST
 'Krishna gave Krishnan two books yesterday.'
- b. Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 193)
kutti-kkə amma paal koʈuttu
 child-DAT mother milk give.PST
 'The mother gave the child milk.'

In Malayalam, there are several ways of signalling companions (Asher & Kumari 1997: 196): either with the noun in the sociative case followed by the postpositions *kuuʈi* (34a), *kuuʈe*, *oppam* or *ottə*, or with the noun in the genitive case followed by *kuuʈe* (34b).

- (34) a. Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 62)
saara kuuʈtukaariy-ooʈə kuuʈi vannu
 Sarah friend.F-SOC along.with come.PST
 'Sarah came with a friend.'
- b. Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 196)
aval kuuʈtukaariy-uʈe kuuʈe vannu
 3 friend.f-GEN along.with come.PST
 'She came with a friend.'

Instruments can be indicated by a specific instrumental postposition *konʈə* – see (32) above – or the instrumental case suffix *-aal*:

- (35) Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 210)
tiiyin-aal kuʈil naʃippikkapettu
 fire-INST hut destroy.PASS.PST
 'The hut was destroyed with(/by) fire.'

While Malayalam possessors are normally dative-marked (Asher & Kumari 1997: 174-175) in predicative possessive constructions, temporary possessors can be expressed in various ways: either by embedding the possessor in a locative phrase meaning 'in X's hand' (36a) or by adding the locative postposition *aʈuttə* 'near' to a genitive-marked noun (36b):

- (36) a. Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 175)
enre kayy-il paṇam uṇṭə
 1S.GEN hand-LOC money be.PRS
 ‘I have money (on me).’
- b. Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 175)
ayaaḷ-uṭe aṭuttə nalla saarikal uṇṭə
 3S-GEN near good sari.P be.PRS
 ‘He has good saris (with him).’

Malayalam uses the case affix *-il* – see (36a) – to indicate generic location (37a), while proximate location uses the postposition *aṭuttə* ‘near’ seen in the previous example sentence (37b) and, interestingly, the selection of the sociative case-marker *-ooṭə* conveys an idea of adjacent location (37c). In addition, an array of other postpositions is used to make finer locative distinctions (see Asher & Kumari 1997: 64-65).

- (37) a. Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 63)
ii kaaṭ-ṭil vaḷare aanakal uṇṭə
 PROX forest-LOC many elephant be.PRS
 ‘There are many elephants in this forest.’
- b. Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 196)
kiṇṇarrin-re aṭuttə ninnu
 well-GEN next.to stand.PST
 ‘[He] stood near the well.’
- c. Malayalam (Nair 2012: 23)
amma kuṇṇiṇ-e neṇc-ooṭu ceerttirunnu
 mother child-ACC bosom-SOC hold.close.PST.CONT
 ‘The mother had held the baby close to her bosom.’

Finally, goals take the same case-marker as recipients:

- (38) Malayalam (Asher & Kumari 1997: 62)
raajamma kaṭa-kkə pooyi
 Rajamma shop-DAT go.PST
 ‘Rajamma went to the shop.’

2.5 *Tamil*

At one point, Indo-Portuguese creoles were used in a wide area of Sri Lanka, comprising both the Tamil-majority and Sinhala-majority parts of the island. The data on which our discussion of Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese, however, comes from the Tamil-speaking region (see 1.1), and therefore we take Tamil as the most relevant adstrate in this study – which is not to say Sinhala linguistic material and/or models could not have made their way into Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese. The primacy of Tamil in this study is supported by previous ones: Smith (1977, 1979a) identified early on significant similarities between Batticaloa Indo-Portuguese and Tamil, and later studies (Smith 2012; Cardoso 2012) show this link to be stronger than that with Sinhala.

2.5.1 Addressees in Tamil

In Tamil, Addressee_{TALK} arguments can be treated in a number of ways. They may take the sociative affix *-oode*⁷ (39a), the animate locative affix *-kitte* (39b), or the dative affix *-ukku* (39c):

- (39) a. Tamil (Asher 1985: 30)
kanṇan daakṭar-oote peecinaan
 Kannan doctor-SOC speak.PST.3SM
 ‘Kannan spoke to the doctor.’
- b. Tamil (Asher 1985: 64)
neettu vantu en-kitte peecana payyan
 yesterday come.PTCP 1S-LOC speak.PST.REL boy
 ‘The boy who came yesterday and spoke to me’
- c. Tamil (Asher 1985: 86)
avan tan-akku taanee peecikittaṇ
 3SM self-DAT EMPH speak.REFL.PST.3SM
 ‘He spoke to himself.’

Addressee_{TELL} arguments can also take a variety of case-markers, but the array is a little different. Instead of the sociative, the literature reports the accusative marker *-e* (40a), but also the animate locative (40b) as a formal/deferential alternative, and the dative (40c) in informal speech:

⁷As examples in this section come from different sources, and these use slightly different conventions for romanisation, some orthographical inconsistency is unavoidable.

- (40) a. Tamil (Asher 1985: 23)
 ... **kaṇṇan-e vara connaaru**
 Kannan-ACC come.INF say.PST.3S
 ‘... told Kannan to come’
- b. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 32)
 dairekṭar kiṭṭe en kaariyatte sonneen
 director LOC 1S concern lay.PST.DEFER
 ‘I laid my concern before the Director.’
- c. Tamil (Steever 2005: 119)
 uṇ-akku lakṣam taram colli irukkireṇ, ippaṭi veṭṭi
 you-DAT 100,000 time tell be.PRS.1S this.way cut
 poṇutu pōkkātē enru
 pass.NEG.IMP say
 ‘I’ve told you 100,000 times not to fritter away your time wastefully like this.’

When it comes to Addressee_{ASK} arguments, the postposition *paattu* (41a) and the animate locative marker (41b) are attested:

- (41) a. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 43)
 avan-e paattu keeṭṭaala?
 he-ACC at ask.PST
 ‘Did she ask him?’
- b. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 189)
 ayyaa-kiṭṭee oru koraccalaana vaaḍaheyle oru viiḍu
 master-LOC a cheap rent-LOC a house
 paakka sollunga!-een
 to.find say.IMP-DEFER
 ‘Would you be so kind as to ask the master to find me a cheap place to live?’

2.5.2 Associate semantic roles in Tamil

Typical patients take the accusative case affix *-e*; accusative-marking carries the notion of definiteness, so that indefinite patients may be unmarked if they are inanimate (Schiffman 1999: 36-37):

- (42) a. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 90)
 tiruḍanga en nay-e koṇṇuṭṭaanga
 thieves my dog-ACC kill.MALICE.PST.3p
 ‘Thieves (in cold blood) killed my dog.’

- b. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 94)

kaar **tondaravu** **koḍuttu-kiṭṭirundadu**; **ad-e** **vittu**
car trouble give-DUR it-ACC sell

toleccuṭṭeen

IMPAT.PST.1S

‘My car was giving me trouble; I sold it off (and was finished with it).’

Recipients typically take the suffix *-ukku/akku/(y)kki*, as demonstrated in (43a); in case they are assigned the animate locative marker *kiṭṭe*, the implication is that the predicate restores previous ownership (43b):

- (43) a. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 32)

avar-ukku muttu maaleye kuḍutteen

3s-DAT pearl necklace give.PST.1S

‘I gave him the pearl necklace.’

- b. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 32)

avar-kiṭṭe muttu maaleye kuḍutteen

3s-LOC pearl necklace give.PST.1S

‘I returned the pearl necklace to him.’

The sociative case-marker *-ooḍe* introduced in 2.5.1 is typically assigned to companions (44a). There are, however, alternative strategies involving the postpositions *kuuḍe* (44b) and *toṇeyle* (44c):

- (44) a. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 35)

sneydar-ooḍe

friend-SOC

‘with a friend’

- b. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 39)

attaan kuuḍe

brother-in-law.NOM with

‘with brother-in-law’

- c. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 40)

enga toṇeyle

we.NOM with

‘with us’

Instruments have a dedicated case affix *-aal(e)*, demonstrated in (45); however, when applied to inanimates, sociative *-oode* may also have an instrumental reading (Schiffman 1999: 34ff).

- (45) Tamil (Krishnamurti 2003: 236)

villin-āl

bow-INST

‘with the bow’

Just as in Malayalam, typical possessors are dative-marked (Schiffman 1999: 29-30) but, in order to convey the notion of temporary possession, the animate locative *-kitte* is selected:

- (46) a. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 32)

en-kitte paṇam irukku

1S-LOC money be.PRS

‘I have money on me.’

The marking of generic location is sensitive to animacy, in that inanimate locations receive the marker *-le* (47a) – reported in Smith (1977) as *-(i)la(y)* for Sri Lanka Tamil (47b) – and animate locations take the marker *-(ki)tte* we have encountered earlier in a variety of functions (47c) – see also (40b):

- (47) a. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 31)

kooyil-le

temple-LOC

‘in the temple’

- b. Tamil (Smith 1977: 146)

enka-Ta vi:TT-ila kataykk-a:ma iṟukk-ra:nka ta:y-takappan!?

we-GEN house-LOC speak-without be-PRS mother-father

‘in our house are [her] parents not speaking it?’

- c. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 31)

avar-tte

he-LOC

‘on him’

Finer semantic locative distinctions make use of several different postpositions. Notions of proximate location, for instance, may be indicated by *pakkattle* (48a), *pakkam* (48b) or *-(a)nde* (48c):

- (48) a. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 37)
kooyil-ukku pakkattle
 temple.DAT near
 'near the temple'
- b. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 39)
meḍraas pakkam
 Madras.NOM near
 'near Madras'
- c. Tamil (Schiffman 1999: 40)
avar-aṇḍe
 he.NOM-near
 'near him'

Inanimate goals are dative-marked in Tamil (49a), while an animate goal takes the animate locative marker (49b):

- (49) a. Tamil (Steever 2005: 119)
avan vīṭṭu-ku ōṭi pōnān
 3SM house-DAT run go.PST.3SM
 'He went running to the house.'
- b. Tamil (Smith 1979a: 198)
appa:-TTa po:
 father-LOC go
 'Go to father.'

3 Analysis

To aid in the discussion, the results of the survey above are given in Table 1, which indicates what markers can be associated with each semantic role in all of the five languages under analysis. In this table, the first column refers to Portuguese and, to make the comparison easier, each of the Dravido-Portuguese creoles are shown next to their respective Dravidian adstrate. In each column, those markers that occur with addressees are given in bold type, so that it becomes clearer what functions they perform in other domains of the language.

Tab. 1: Markers attested in the languages under study for each semantic role; for each language, bold forms are the ones used to mark Addressee arguments.

	Portuguese	Malayalam	Malabar I-P	Sri Lanka I-P	Tamil
Addressee _{TALK}	com N	N-ooṭə	N-(sə) pærtə N-jūtadə	N-(u)ntu N juuntu	N-ooḍe N-(ki)tte N-(u)kku
Addressee _{TELL}	a N	N-ooṭə	N-(sə) pærtə	N-pə N-(u)ntu N-(u)ntaa	N-e N-(ki)tte [FORMAL] N-(u)kku [COLL]
Addressee _{ASK}	a N	N-ooṭə	N-(sə) pærtə	N-(u)ntu N-(u)ntaa	N-(ki)tte [FORMAL] N-e paattu
Patient	∅ N a N [+HUM]	N-e [+HUM] N ∅ [-ANIM]	N-pə [+HUM] N ∅ [-ANIM]	N-pə [+HUM] N ∅ [-ANIM]	N-e [+HUM] N ∅ [-ANIM -DEF]
Recipient	a N	N-kkə/(n)ə	N-pə	N-pə	N-(u)kku N-(ki)tte
Companion	com N <i>mais N</i> <i>junto com N</i>	N-ooṭə N-ooṭə oppam/ottə N-ooṭə oppam/ottə N-uṭe kuṭe	N-jūtadə	N juuntu	N-ooḍe N <i>kuṭe</i> N <i>toṇeyle</i>
Instrument	com N	N-aal N konṭə	N-jūtadə	N <i>wə:ndə</i>	N-aal N-ooḍe [-ANIM]
Temporary possessor	N1 + com N1	N-re kayyil N-re/uṭe aṭuttə	N-sə mō-dētrə	N-(u)ntu N-(u)ntaa	N-(ki)tte
Location	<i>em N</i> <i>perto de N</i> <i>junto a/de N</i>	N-il N-re/uṭe aṭuttə N-ooṭə	N-dētrə N-(sə)pærtə	N-(u)ntu N-(u)ntaa [+HUM] N-(su) <i>pærtu</i>	N- <i>le/(i)la(y)</i> [-ANIM] N-(ki)tte [+ANIM] N <i>aṇḍe</i> N <i>pakkam</i> N <i>pakkattule</i>
Goal	<i>para N</i> [-TMP] a N [+TMP]	N-kkə/(n)ə	N ∅ N-pə	N-(u)ntu [+ANIM] N ∅ [-ANIM]	N-(u)kku N-(ki)tte

For our purposes, it is now important to consider the sources of the actual linguistic forms used in the Dravido-Portuguese creoles (the *matter*, see 1.2) and of their functional distribution (the *pattern*), and the ways in which our data reveals processes of reanalysis and reconfiguration. One preliminary observation is that, in terms of matter, all morphemes used to mark addressees in Dravido-Portuguese are derived from Portuguese: MIP has *pærtə* from PTG *perto* ‘near’ and *jütadə* from PTG *juntado* ‘joined/connected’ (and the connecting genitive marker-*sə* from PTG *sua* ‘his/her(s)/their(s) [fem.sg.]’; SLIP has both *juuntu* and *-(u)ntu* ultimately from PTG *junto* ‘together/next to’, *-(u)ntaa* from PTG *juntado* ‘joined/connected’, and *-pə* from PTG *para* ‘to’. However, a look at Table 1 also shows that none of these Portuguese morphemes mark addressees in that language; in order to understand how they came to be used with addressees in the Dravido-Portuguese creoles, we must first explain their functional range in the creoles.

3.1 *Sourcing the functional range of addressee markers in Dravido-Portuguese*

Even though Portuguese appears to be the only relevant donor of morphological material for markers of addressees in the creoles, the use of these markers could, in principle, have been influenced by Portuguese or their respective local adstrates (Malayalam in the case of the Malabar, Tamil in the case of northeastern Sri Lanka). To establish whether single lexifier/adstrate markers provide adequate models for the creoles, I have compared the functional range of the markers associated with addressees in Dravido-Portuguese with that of the markers in their donor languages with which any of them coincides at least once in Table 1. The results are given in Tables 2 and 3 (for the Malabar and Sri Lanka respectively); I have considered in this comparison only the creole markers which occur with addressees, excluding the markers in the donor languages which never coincide with them.

In these tables, each cell contains an equation $\mathbf{x}/\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{z}$, in which: \mathbf{y} stands for the number of semantic roles in which at least one of the two markers being compared are attested; \mathbf{x} indicates the number of semantic roles in which they coincide; and the division of \mathbf{x} by \mathbf{y} results in a value (\mathbf{z}) between 0 and 1 for the degree of coincidence between the two markers, in which 0 indicates no match at all and 1 indicates a complete match. Shaded cells indicate equations which result in a \mathbf{z} -value higher than .5, i.e. pairs in which the two markers coincide in more than half of their attested uses. While this is indeed a possibility, it is worth noting that in English, which arrived on the scene later and is nowadays spoken extensively by the small MIP-speaking

Tab. 2: Distributional similarity between addressee markers in Malabar Indo-Portuguese and markers in its donor languages Portuguese and Malayalam.

	N-(<i>sə</i>) <i>pærtə</i>	N - <i>jūtadə</i>	
PTG <i>com</i> N	1/7 = .14	3/4 = .75	
PTG <i>a</i> N	2/7 = .29	0/8 = 0	
PTG <i>mais</i> N	0/5 = 0	1/3 = .33	
PTG <i>junto com</i> N	0/5 = 0	1/3 = .33	
PTG <i>em</i> N	1/4 = .25	0/4 = 0	
PTG <i>perto de</i> N	1/4 = .25	0/4 = 0	
PTG <i>junto a/de</i> N	1/5 = .2	0/4 = 0	
	4/4 = 1	1/6 = .17	MAL N- <i>ooṭə</i>
	0/5 = 0	1/3 = .33	MAL N- <i>ooṭə kuuṭi</i>
	0/5 = 0	1/3 = .33	MAL N- <i>ooṭə kuute</i>
	0/5 = 0	1/3 = .33	MAL N- <i>ooṭə oppam</i>
	0/5 = 0	1/3 = .33	MAL N- <i>ooṭə ottə</i>
	0/5 = 0	1/3 = .33	MAL N- <i>uṭe kuute</i>
	0/5 = 0	1/3 = .33	MAL N- <i>aal</i>
	0/5 = 0	1/3 = .33	MAL N <i>koṇṭə</i>
	1/4 = .25	0/4 = 0	MAL N- <i>il</i>
	1/5 = .2	0/5 = 0	MAL N- <i>re/uṭe aṭuttə</i>

community, the preposition *with* has a functional range very similar to that of PTG *com*: it is both a comitative and an instrumental marker, and it can be used with Addressee_{TALK} arguments but not the other addressee types. In addition, *-jūtadə* only occurs with Addressee_{TALK} arguments in elicited sentences collected through the use of English as an intermediary language, which opens the possibility that on-the-fly translational constraints might be responsible for it.

When it comes to Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese, the data in Table 3 reveals some interesting similarities and differences, in particular with respect to the SLIP elements *juuntu*, *-(u)ntu* and *-(u)ntaa*. As explained earlier in 2.3.1, the SLIP elements *juuntu* and *-(u)ntu* have a common origin but, if treated separately, it becomes clear that the most relevant match for the functional scope of *juuntu* is the Tamil sociative marker *-ooḍe* while the use of *-(u)ntu* is particularly similar to that of the Tamil animate locative *-(ki)tṭe*. With respect to the first pair, the only function in which SLIP *juuntu* and TAM-*ooḍe* do not coincide is the expression of instrumental semantics with non-animates.

Tab. 3: Distributional similarity between addressee markers in Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese and markers in its donor languages (Portuguese and Tamil).

	N <i>juuntu</i>	N-(u) <i>ntu</i>	N-(u) <i>ntaa</i>	N- <i>pə</i>	
PTG <i>com</i> N	2/4 = .5	2/8 = .25	1/7 = .14	0/7 = 0	
PTG <i>a</i> N	0/7 = 0	3/8 = .38	2/7 = .29	3/5 = .6	
PTG \emptyset N	0/3 = 0	0/7 = 0	0/5 = 0	1/3 = .33	
PTG <i>mais</i> N	1/2 = .5	0/7 = 0	0/5 = 0	0/4 = 0	
PTG <i>junto com</i> N	1/2 = .5	0/7 = 0	0/5 = 0	0/4 = 0	
PTG <i>em</i> N	0/3 = 0	1/6 = .17	1/4 = .25	0/4 = 0	
PTG <i>perto de</i> N	0/3 = 0	1/6 = .17	1/4 = .25	0/4 = 0	
PTG <i>junto a/de</i> N	0/3 = 0	1/6 = .17	1/4 = .25	0/4 = 0	
PTG <i>para</i> N	0/3 = 0	1/6 = .17	0/5 = 0	0/4 = 0	
	2/3 = .67	1/8 = .13	0/7 = 0	0/6 = 0	TAM N- <i>oode</i>
	1/8 = .13	6/7 = .86	4/7 = .57	2/8 = .25	TAM N-(<i>ki</i>) <i>tte</i>
	1/5 = .2	3/7 = .43	1/7 = .14	2/5 = .4	TAM N-(u) <i>kku</i>
	0/4 = 0	1/7 = .14	1/5 = .2	2/3 = .67	TAM N- <i>e</i>
	0/3 = 0	1/6 = .17	1/4 = .25	0/4 = 0	TAM N- <i>e paattu</i>
	0/3 = 0	0/7 = 0	0/5 = 0	1/3 = .33	TAM N \emptyset
	1/2 = .5	0/7 = 0	0/5 = 0	0/4 = 0	TAM N <i>kuude</i>
	1/2 = .5	0/7 = 0	0/5 = 0	0/4 = 0	TAM N <i>toneyle</i>
	0/3 = 0	1/6 = .17	1/4 = .25	0/4 = 0	TAM N- <i>le/(i)la(y)</i>
	0/3 = 0	1/6 = .17	1/4 = .25	0/4 = 0	TAM N- <i>aṇde</i>
	0/3 = 0	1/6 = .17	1/4 = .25	0/4 = 0	TAM N <i>pakkam</i>
	0/3 = 0	1/6 = .17	1/4 = .25	0/4 = 0	TAM N <i>pakkattule</i>

One should note, however, that this is a secondary function of TAM *-oode* (see 2.5.2) and that overall Tamil distinguishes companions and instruments formally. It is perhaps more significant that Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese sides with its Dravidian adstrate in this respect, in contradistinction to Portuguese. Having said that, it is also noteworthy that other elements achieve a .5 match value with SLIP *juuntu*, namely all those that mark companions in either donor language: PTG *com*, *mais* and *junto com*, and TAM *kuude* and *toneyle*.⁸ Both the Tamil sociative marker *-oode* and the Portuguese comitative/instrumental marker *com* could motivate the functional expansion of SLIP *juuntu* to Addressee_{TALK} but not to Addressee_{TELL} nor Addressee_{ASK}. All in all, it is safe to say that, based on the data in Tables 1 and 3, the lead of TAM *-oode* over PTG *com* as the most relevant model for the functional range of SLIP *juuntu* is marginal; further analysis of the use of *juuntu* in contexts in which the Portuguese and Tamil markers diverge (e.g. with stimuli of psych verbs) may clarify the situation.

As noted earlier, *-(u)ntu* achieves the highest match value with the Tamil animate locative *-(ki)tte* but, interestingly, so does SLIP *-(u)ntaa*. These two elements have slightly different etymological sources (see 2.2.1) and are treated in descriptions of the language as slightly different in function too, with *-(u)ntaa* being reserved for human referents. However, in this function, there seems to be quite some competition from *-(u)ntu*, which, in addition to functioning as a generic locative, is also attested with animate and even human referents (e.g., in the case of addressees, but also possessors and animate goals). As a matter of fact, the match is more significant between TAM *-(ki)tte* and SLIP *-(u)ntu* (.86) than between TAM *-(ki)tte* and SLIP *-(u)ntaa* (.57). The only function in which *-(ki)tte* is not matched by *-(u)ntu*, according to the available data, is its use as a marker of recipients in the rather specific contexts that convey the sense of restoring previous ownership (see 2.5.2). As for *-(u)ntaa*, it does not mirror the use of *-(ki)tte* with Addressee_{TALK} arguments, recipients, and animate goals; considering that the available corpora contain less examples of *-(u)ntaa* than *-(u)ntu*, however, one cannot be certain that *-(u)ntaa* is disallowed in these functions. The functional scope of the Tamil animate locative is therefore essential to understand that of both SLIP *-(u)ntu* and *-(u)ntaa* (including their use as markers of addressees) but, interestingly, the

⁸SLIP *juuntu* occupies a particularly small number of cells in Table 1 (only 2) and, with the exception of PTG *com*, all the other donor language elements occur in 1 cell only. Under these circumstances, one should bear in mind that any single match or mismatch is bound to have a large impact on the final match value.

creole does not mirror univocally the Dravidian distinction between animate and non-animate locative markers: while the distribution of *-(u)ntaa* appears to be confined to animate (or perhaps human) referents, *-(u)ntu* waives such a restriction and, in this respect only, sides more closely with Portuguese.

When it comes to SLIP *-pə*, it is interesting that two elements in the donor languages achieve close high scores: TAM accusative *-e* (.67) and PTG dative *a* (.6). As described in 2.2.2, SLIP *-pə* is termed oblique precisely because it extends to recipients and animate patients. This conflation is not uncommon in the Portuguese-lexified creoles of South Asia (cf. the distribution of MIP *-pə* in Table 1; also Clements 1996: 160ff; Cardoso 2009: 180ff) and elsewhere in Asia (cf. Baxter 1988), as discussed in detail in Clements (2009: 55ff). A look at Table 1 shows that, with respect to this particular syncretism, it is Classical Portuguese that provides the most significant input, with its possibility to attribute the typical dative preposition *a* also to human patients (see 2.3.2), whereas both Portuguese and the Dravidian adstrates could account for the association of overt accusative marking with human participants. With regard to the use of SLIP *-pə* with addressees, the functional range of both TAM *-e* and PTG *a* could be invoked, with the caveat that the occurrence of the latter with Addressee_{ASK} arguments does not seem to be paralleled by SLIP *-pə*. Again, though, the scarcity of available data does not allow us to rule out the use of *-pə* in this function and, as a result, we must relativise the small lead TAM *-e* appears to have over PTG *a* as a model for the use of SLIP *-pə*.

3.2 *Diachronic excursus: contact-induced functional reanalysis*

We have noticed, at the outset of section 3, that none of the Portuguese etyma for the Dravido-Portuguese addressee markers have that function in the lexifier language, and they are also not part of the donor language elements which emerged as particularly significant to account for the functional range of the creole markers. This implies the operation of a diachronic process by which, during the development of the Dravido-Portuguese creoles, Portuguese markers and their functions came to be rearranged. In this sub-section, we will attempt to reconstruct this process for each of the Dravido-Portuguese addressee markers, to the extent possible.

MIP *-(sə) pərtə*, as we have seen, derives its functional distribution from MAL *-ootə* and its phonological form from PTG *perto* (*de*). The cooption of this particular Portuguese form is easily explained on the basis of the data contained in Table 1, as both PTG *perto* (*de*) and MAL *-ootə* have locative functions. To be more precise, PTG *perto* (*de*) is a marker of proximate location, whereas MAL *-ootə* indicates adjacency. While these locative categories are not

coincidental, their association is perhaps based on the notion that, logically, adjacency implies proximate location (but not the other way around). Once this connection was established, the process of functional reanalysis (in this case, functional expansion) of PTG *perto* (*de*) on the basis of MAL *-ooʔə* could proceed, resulting in the modern functional range of MIP *-(sə) pərtə*.

As for MIP *-jütadə*, we have established that its form is derived from PTG *juntado* and much of its functional distribution appears to be modelled on PTG *com*. While PTG *juntado* (a participle form of the verb *juntar* ‘to join, connect’) does not occur as such in Table 1, the related adverb *junto* ‘together, next to’ (see 2.3.2) does, involved in the expression of proximate location and comitative. The shared comitative semantics of Portuguese *junto* (*com*)/*junto(s)* and *com* is perhaps the key to why, in Malabar Indo-Portuguese, a derivative of the former could take over a portion of the functional range of the latter to encompass instrument-marking and Addressee_{TALK}-marking.

The same Portuguese cluster (*junto* and *juntado*) is also involved in the development of three Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese markers, viz. *juuntu*, *-(u)ntu* and *-(u)ntaa*. However, as noted in 3.1, their function range reveals the influence of two different Tamil case-markers, viz. *-oode* and *-(ki)tte*. With respect to SLIP *juuntu*, the process of functional reanalysis was probably motivated by the coincidence of PTG *junto* and TAM *-oode* as markers of companions, while in the case of *-(u)ntaa* the relevant functional match is that between PTG *junto* (/ *juntado*) and TAM *-(ki)tte* in the locative domain. In the case of *-(u)ntu*, the explanation is similar to that for *-(u)ntaa*, but there is the additional question of whether there was ever a stage in the creole in which a single form (perhaps *juuntu* or similar) covered the combined functional range of modern-day *juuntu* + *-(u)ntu*, before a process of speciation and phonological reduction resulted in the modern-day distribution. An answer to this question is likely to lie in a critical analysis of older texts written in Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese, which lies beyond the scope of this study.

Finally, the case of SLIP *-pə* is a little more complex. If we were to limit ourselves to Table 1, we might propose that the fact that both PTG *para* (the etymon, also typically a marker of beneficiaries) and PTG *a* (one of the relevant functional models) can be used to mark goals provides the grounds for the association between matter and pattern which resulted in modern SLIP *-pə*. This may be so, but the fact that *para* or derivatives of it have additional functions (e.g. as addressee- or recipient-markers) not only in various other Portuguese-based creoles but also in some varieties of Portuguese (such as Brazilian Portuguese) raises the possibility that, in spoken Classical Portuguese, the functional similarity between *para* and *a* was closer than the available sources and descriptions indicate. This issue, once again, goes beyond the scope of the current comparative work, and stands as a final suggestion of further research which highlights the potential of the study of creole languages to challenge and motivate other domains of linguistic inquiry.

Abbreviations

ACC accusative, COM comitative, COND conditional, CONJ conjunction, CONT continuous, DAT dative, DEF definite, DEFER deferential, DEM demonstrative, DUR durative, EMPH emphasis, FUT future, GEN genitive, HAB habitual, HON honorific, IMP imperative, IMPFV imperfective, IND indefinite, INF infinitive, INST instrumental, INT interrogative, IRR irrealis, LOC locative, MAL Malayalam, MIP Malabar Indo-Portuguese, N noun, NEG negative, NOM nominative, NP noun phrase, OBL oblique, OBLIG obligation, PASS passive, PFV perfective, POT potential, PROX proximate, PRS present, PST past, PTCP participle, PTG Portuguese, QUOT quotative, REFL reflexive, REL relative, SLIP Sri Lanka Indo-Portuguese, SOC sociative, TAG tag, TAM Tamil.

References

- Asher, R.E. 1985. *Tamil*. London: Croom Helm.
- Asher, R.E. & T.C. Kumari. 1997. *Malayalam* [Descriptive Grammars Series]. London/New York: Routledge.
- Bakker, Peter. 2006. The Sri Lanka Sprachbund: The newcomers Portuguese and Malay. In Matras, Yaron, April McMahon & Nigel Vincent (eds.) *Linguistic Areas: Convergence in Historical and Typological Perspective*, 135–159. New York: Palgrave.
- Baxter, Alan N. 1988. *A Grammar of Kristang (Malacca Creole Portuguese)*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Cardoso, Hugo C. 2006. Challenges to Indo-Portuguese across India. In Elangayan, R., R. McKenna Brown, N. Ostler & M.K. Verma (eds.) *Proceedings of the FEL X*, 23–30. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.
- Cardoso, Hugo C. 2009. The Indo-Portuguese Language of Diu. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
- Cardoso, Hugo C. 2012. Luso-Asian comparatives in comparison. In Cardoso, Hugo C., Alan N. Baxter & Mário Pinharanda Nunes (eds.) *Ibero-Asian Creoles: Comparative perspectives*, 81–123. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cardoso, Hugo C., Alan N. Baxter & Mário Pinharanda Nunes. 2012. Introduction. In Cardoso, Hugo C., Alan N. Baxter & Mário Pinharanda Nunes (eds.) *Ibero-Asian Creoles: Comparative perspectives*, 1–14. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Clements, J. Clancy. 1996. *The Genesis of a language: The formation and development of Korlai Portuguese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Clements, J. Clancy. 2000. Evidência para a existência de um pidgin português asiático. In d'Andrade, E., Dulce Pereira & M.A. Mota, (eds.) *Crioulos de base lexical portuguesa*. Braga: Associação Portuguesa de Linguística.

Clements, J. Clancy. 2009. *The linguistic legacy of Spanish and Portuguese: Colonial expansion and language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dalgado, Sebastião Rodolfo. 1900. *Dialecto Indo-Portugues de Ceylão*. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional.

Dalgado, Sebastião Rodolfo. 1917. Dialecto Indo-Português de Negapatão. *Revista Lusitana* 20: 40-53.

Grant, Anthony P. 2012. Mindanao Chabacano and other 'mixed creoles'; Sourcing the morphemic components. In Cardoso, Hugo C., Alan N. Baxter & Mário Pinharanda Nunes (eds.) *Ibero-Asian Creoles: Comparative perspectives*, 327-364. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jackson, K. David. 1990. *Sing Without Shame. Oral Traditions in Indo-Portuguese Creole Verse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Krishnamurti, Bhadriraju. 2003. *The Dravidian languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ladhams, John. 2009. The formation of the Portuguese-based Creoles: Gradual or abrupt? In Selbach, Rachel, Hugo C. Cardoso & Margot van den Berg (eds.) *Gradual creolization: Studies Celebrating Jacques Arends*, 279-303. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nair, R.S.S. 2012. *A Grammar of Malayalam*. Language in India <<http://www.languageinindia.com/nov2012/ravisankarmalayalamgrammar.pdf>>

Schäfer-Prieß, Barbara. 2002. O acusativo preposicional na história da língua portuguesa. In Head, Brian F., J. Teixeira, A.S. Lemos, A.L. de Barros & A. Pereira (eds.) *História da língua e história da gramática*, 405-419. Braga: Universidade do Minho/ILCH.

Schiffman, Harold F. 1999. *A Reference Grammar of Spoken Tamil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schuchardt, Hugo. 1882. Kreolische Studien II. Über das Indoportugiesische von Cochim. *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien* (Philosophisch-historische Klasse) 102: 799-816.

Schuchardt, Hugo. 1883. Kreolische Studien VI. Über das Indoportugiesische von Mangalore. *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien* (philosophisch-historische Klasse) 105(III): 882-904.

Schuchardt, Hugo. 1889a. Beiträge zur Kenntnis des creolischen Romanisch. V. Allgemeineres über das Indoportugiesische (Asioportugiesische). *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 13: 476-516.

Schuchardt, Hugo. 1889b. Beiträge zur Kenntnis des kreolischen Romanisch: VI. Zum Indoportugiesischen von Mahé und Cannanore. *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 13: 516-524.

Silva Neto, Serafim da. 1970. *História da Língua Portuguesa* (2nd edition). Rio de Janeiro: Livros de Portugal.

Smith, Ian R. 1977. Sri Lanka Creole Portuguese Phonology. Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University.

Smith, Ian R. 1979a. Convergence in South Asia: a creole example. *Lingua* 48: 193-222.

Smith, Ian R. 1979b. *Substrata vs. universals* in the formation of Sri Lanka Portuguese. *Papers in Pidgin and Creole Linguistics* 2: 183-200.

Smith, Ian R. 2012. Measuring substrate influence: Word order features in Ibero-Asian creoles. In Cardoso, Hugo C., Alan N. Baxter & Mário Pinharanda Nunes (eds.) *Ibero-Asian Creoles: Comparative perspectives*, 125-148. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Smith, Ian R. 2013. Sri Lanka Portuguese structure dataset. In Michaelis, Susanne M., Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.) *Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. (Available online at <http://apics-online.info/contributions/41>, accessed 18.12.2013)

Smith, Norval. 1995. An annotated list of creoles, pidgins, and mixed languages. In Arends, Jacques, Pieter Muysken & Norval Smith (eds.) *Pidgins and Creoles - An introduction*, 331-374. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Steever, S.B. 2005. *The Tamil Auxiliary Verb System*. Oxon: Routledge.

Tavares de Mello, B.C. 1908. Dialecto Indo-Portuguez de Ceylão; Te Deum Laudamus. *O Oriente Portuguez* V: 373-390. [Reprinted in Tavares de Mello, B.C. 1998. Folclores Ceiloneses: Colectânea de textos do crioulo português do Ceilão, 115-130. Lisbon: Comissão Nacional para as Comemorações dos Descobrimentos Portugueses.]

Teyssier, Paul. 2005. *A língua de Gil Vicente*. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional – Casa da Moeda.

Teza. Emilio. 1872. Indo-portoghese. *Il Propugnatore* 5: 1-10.

Tomás, Maria Isabel. 1992. *Os Crioulos Portugueses do Oriente; Uma Bibliografia*. Macau: Instituto Cultural de Macau.

Verschueren, Jef. 1981. Basic linguistic action verbs. *Cahiers de Linguistique Française* 2: 71-88.

Received: 06/30/2013

Accepted: 12/01/2013
